DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 155 SP 035 558

AUTHOR Mitchell, Jane
TITLE Negotiating the Practice of Teaching.
PUB DATE Jul 94
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Teacher Education Association (24th, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, July 3-6, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Cooperating Teachers; Feedback; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; High Schools; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Relationship; Interviews; Semantics; *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper presents two case studies that analyze how associate teachers and high school student teachers participate in post-lesson annual meetings evaluating what the student teacher does in the classroom. Semantic scripts are used to get to the heart of the meaning of "evaluate," and evaluation as a cultural activity is emphasized. The following issues are highlighted in each case study: use of "I," "you," and "we"; relationship between knower and knowee; extent to which the evaluative criteria were negotiated; amount of talking by each person; and congruence between the post-lesson annual meeting and the follow-up interview. One of the cases is based on the associate teacher adopting a "you learn from me" approach, where evaluation criteria were not negotiated, roles of participants were hierarchical, and dominant values expressed were those of the teacher. The other is based much more on a "let's find out together" model, in which criteria were negotiated, roles were collaborative, and what the participants value in their teaching was based on joint understanding between student and teacher. The paper concludes that when the meaning of "evaluate" is based on shared understanding and interaction between participants is relational, there is potential to reflect on practice and enhance learning. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 155

Title: Negotiating the Practice of Teaching

Author: Jane Mitchell, Charles Sturt University, Riverina

Paper presented at the Australian Teacher Education Association Annual Conference. Brisbane 1994.

What takes place in the negotiations between associate teachers and student teachers during the practicum? What impact does this have on the everyday practice of classroom teaching? How do the participants resolve their questions relating to curriculum with its concern for social purpose and pedagogy? At best practicum evaluation serves as a means by which the knowledge of teaching can be shared within a jointly constructed framework. Good teaching can be seen as the product of reflective action and is sensitive to different kinds of understanding. In order for student teachers to do good teaching they need access to the kinds of knowledge that make this understanding possible. At worst the evaluative process can reinforce associate or supervising teachers' control of not only the discourse but also of this knowledge. The student teacher becomes caught in the procedures and rituals of the classroom without considering, questioning or comprehending the overall purpose of what is being done.

Post lesson conferences are an important part of the practicum experience. So what ought to happen there? In this paper two case studies will be considered and analysed with respect to how the associate teacher and student teacher participate in post lesson conferences in order to evaluate what the student teacher does in the classroom. I have chosen these cases because whilst there are commonalities they represent quite different ways of evaluating. The contrast has helped to highlight the different meaning of evaluate in each context. Semantic scripts have been used to get to the heart of the meaning of evaluate in each context. My understanding of the verb evaluate illuminates for me how people in our culture conceive of this activity. It is important to consider evaluating as a cultural activity that has meaning for the participants. I wish to consider this activity with respect to the relationship between the participants and how they negotiate the evaluative criteria.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Mitchell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP035358

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Point of view

My interest in this area developed initially when I worked as an associate teacher in schools with student teachers and more recently as a liaison lecturer and teacher educator. The matching of student teacher and associate teacher is usually one of chance and the relationship that develops and the nature of the experience depends on a multitude of factors, not least of which are the values of the participants and the context in which they are in. I was struck by the variety of ways in which teachers evaluated student teachers. I was also struck by the feeling that some of the ways of evaluating, particularly in the post lesson conferences were better than others.

The analysis of what is said or not said in the evaluations will require a theoretical perspective. It will not be possible to make sense of things without a point of view on education and teacher education. I wish to discuss the data first of all from my own point of view but at the same time I want to take account of what other people have said. In doing this it is important to acknowledge the interplay within and between perspectives and philosophies. My point of view will be articulated with respect to the meaning of the verb evaluate that is evident in the two cases.

To this end my interpretation of the data will be drawing on semantic theory in terms of considering what it means to evaluate. In this respect I wish to acknowledge the significant work in this area done by Shopen and Shopen (1994). As linguists and language educators much of their work has focussed on meanings of activities in cultural contexts. They would suggest that establishing a common purpose of an activity is dependent on a shared understanding of what that activity means. Semantic explications are a way to get to the core of the meaning of an activity within a particular context. Using their ideas it is both useful and important to think about what evaluate means in the two contexts in which these cases take place. The evaluative process means something quite different in each case. Script 1 emerged from and provides the basis for analysis of Case Study 1 and Script 2 for Case Study 2.

Script 1:

> ***I evaluate what you are doing***
> **- in the supervision of practice teaching**
> (A) You are doing something

(B) I am thinking about what you have done

(C) I am thinking about what I think is good practice and I think that what I do is good practice

(D) I am thinking about what you have done with respect to what I think is good practice

(E) I want to tell you what I think about your practice

(F) I think you should do as I do

(G) I have the authority to tell you these things

(H) I know more than you do

(I) I say things to you about what I think of your practice

Script 2:

We evaluate what you are doing
- in the supervision of practice teaching

(A) You have done something. Before you did it we talked about what you were going to do

(B) We are thinking about what you have done and we say to each other what we think

(C) We are each thinking about good practice and we tell each other what we think with respect to that

(D) I am thinking about what you have done with resect to what I think and what you think is good practice

(E) I want to tell you about what I think about your practice but I also want to hear what you think about your practice

(F) I would like us to agree on what we think is good practice

(G) I have the authority to tell you these things

(H) I know more than you do but I acknowledge you know things too

(I) We say things to each other

(J) What we say to each other affects what we might do in our future practice

Each script says something about the associate teacher/student teacher relationship through the evaluative process in a particular context. Both relationships, with respect to the meaning of evaluate, rest on a knower/knowee distinction and in each script the knower, the associate teacher, is placing value on something that the knowee has done. They do this because of what they know and because of their authority. In the first script the assumption made is that the knower knows everything and the knowee very little. What is said is based on the subjective understanding of the knower. The way that the pronoun 'I' is positioned signifies this. In the second script the dualism implicit in the meaning of evaluate is not as pronounced. The pronoun 'we' indicates that evaluating is subjective and intersubjective in that both participants know something and say to each other what they know. The value placed on the teaching activity is negotiated, agreed upon and shared.

Script 2 is more productive than Script 1 for both practical and critical reasons. Evaluating incorporates a dialectical quality in Script 2 in a way that extends teaching and learning possibilities for the participants. I am drawing on Proppes's (1982) understanding of dialectical in this context. Dialectical "is a convenient term for the kind of thinking which takes place when human beings enter into friendly (meaning well intentioned, cooperative, genial and genuine) dialogue in order to find synthesis, or when they engage in reflection and self reflection." (in Smyth 1991:32). The relationship between associate teacher and student teacher inherent in the meaning of evaluate in this script is based on an assumption that both participants are knowers and knowees, both are thinkers and doers, both are

theorists and practitioners. This is important because it acknowledges the knowledge of the student teacher. Knowing about teaching in the evaluative context is then constructed jointly by the associate teacher and student teacher. In this sense knowledge of teaching is not a given that is merely transmitted. Built into this is the possibility for reflective practice of the sort advocated by Della Fish (1989). For her the student should:

> possess the skills, ability, dispositions, understanding, and capacity to create, discover, use, and evaluate his/her own theories of action in order that in all his/her work with pupils he/she is committed to facilitating their learning to their highest potential, and concomitantly to learning him/herself how better to do so. (179)

Within the meaning of evaluate in Script 2 is the possibility for the student teacher to do some of the things that Fish suggests because the evaluative process is two way. This is crucial because the student teacher is better able to learn through reflecting on their own practice. Here I agree with Donald Shon (1987), who states that knowing that comes from reflecting is more valuable than knowing that is technical, instrumental and rule based. (39) This sort of reflecting does have emancipatory possibilities. However I am not sure whether this form of reflecting is critical in the sense that it sets any transforming into a political and social context. The meaning of evaluate in script 2 is possibly, but not necessarily 'critical' in the way that Zeichner and Liston (1991) suggest:

> During student teaching and other practice teaching experiences, students should be asked to reflect on their own assumptions and beliefs with a view to further articulating and justifying their views, and efforts should be made to link available knowledge about social context to their experiences in order to highlight potential obstacles to their chosen professional orientation. (87)

The 'critical' component of their point of view is linking social context to experience. To incorporate more 'critical' ideas into the meaning of evaluate the concept of good practice needs to be scrutinised with respect to what others think is good practice and how and why they think that. Likewise as Cherryholmes (1993) points out:

> Critical theorists of the Frankfurt School argue that knowledge is not independent of human interests, work and interaction. When it comes to what knowledge students learn, critical educators attempt to disclose the underlying arrangements of social and political power and their justifying

> ideologies. Attempts are then made to trace how power and ideologies of power weave through the hegemonic values and practices of education. (11)

Identifying the extent to which dichotomies underpin both the meaning of evaluate and the nature of relationships in practicum contexts is important in disclosing power arrangements and hegemonic values. Evaluations in the post lesson conferences are contexts in which knowledge is constructed and power relationships played out. Although beyond the scope of this paper, the work of educationalists as diverse as John Dewey (1944:333) and Bronwyn Davies (1994:8-9) suggest that dichotomies that are binary opposites are a source of ways of thinking that can be oppressive and that perpetuate, through the very way that we think, the dominance of ruling class and Davies would add white and masculinised ways of thinking. In this context, if the evaluative discourse is predicated on an oppositional relationship between the participants, that is a hierarchical distinction between knower and knowee, Davies would suggest that this dichotomy would rest on a male/female dichotomy. The implication of this in the evaluative context would be that the discourse is masculinised and can be deconstructed to reveal power imbalances.

Methodology

This research is part of a broader study analysing the evaluative conversations between student teachers and their associate teachers during practicum. The student teachers were enrolled in the Graduate Diploma of Education (Secondary) at the University of Canberra. The students in this study were all completing a Social Science Curriculum unit. For their practice teaching placements the student teachers were in both junior high schools (Yrs 7-10) or senior colleges (Yrs 11-12). 'Associate' teacher is the term used for teachers in schools who have responsibility for evaluating student teachers.

The post lesson conferences between student teachers and associate teachers were taped. The post lesson conferences were not staged in any way. Having the tape recorder playing may have had an impact on the nature of what was said in the evaluation, but we stressed to the participants that we wanted them to talk as they normally would. In most instances participants did this.

The tapes were transcribed. An analysis of these transcriptions in terms of what was said and also what was not said is the starting point for examining the roles and values of the

participants and the criteria used for evaluating. The transcriptions were returned to the participants. Each participant was interviewed after they had read the transcription. The purpose of the interview was to enable the participants to talk about their understanding of the evaluation. They were given the chance to say why they said particular things, the importance of particular evaluative criteria, how they perceived their roles, the degree to which the evaluation reflected and/or helped shape their thinking about teaching and what they considered important teaching knowledge and to provide background information and contextual details that could not be seen within the transcriptions. The interviews were semi structured in the sense that there were some initial questions to open the conversation, but these changed and were modified depending on the situation and interests of the interviewee and the range of issues that emerged in the post lesson conference.

A huge amount of data has emerged from the post lesson conferences and the follow up interviews. The problem with such an amount of data is making sense of it. What I have been struck by so far is the variety and richness of what people said and did and more interestingly why they said and did things. From this data it is possible to make some observations about what people understand the verbs evaluate and teach to mean and to consider the impact this has on their thinking and actions in both the post lesson conference and classroom practice. The relatively unstructured data, whilst messy to deal with, is most useful in that there is a greater possibility of uncovering the participants perspectives and values. These values and perspectives can then be set within a broader context and culture of teaching.

Contextual details and background information

Of the twelve cases that are part of the broader study, I have chosen in this paper to consider two because there are some interesting points of comparison and contrast. I was the liaison lecturer in these two cases and so had the opportunity to get to know the participants. In both cases the student teachers are working with Year 11 students in classes that have a strong 'academic' focus. In both these cases issues of management are not foregrounded during the post lesson conference unlike many instances in Year 7-10 classes. The way in which the participants evaluate the lesson is quite different in these two cases. Case 1 is based on the teacher adopting a 'you learn from me' approach whereas Case 2 is based much more on a 'let's find out together' model.

Both student teachers were particularly enthusiastic and thoughtful in their approach to teaching practice. Helen had an Arts degree and Malcolm an Economics degree and both had worked prior to deciding to do the Diploma in Education. Both Helen and Malcolm were in their late twenties. Malcolm had chosen to go to a private co-educational high school for his second round of field experience in the one year program. His associate teacher, Tony was in his late thirties. Malcolm was the second student teacher that Tony had had. Helen was doing her second field experience unit at a secondary college, teaching History. Her associate teacher, Richard was in his late thirties as well.

The Case Studies - interpreting the data

In considering the relationship between the participants in each case, there are certain issues that emerge that provide the starting point for both analysis and comparison. The issues and components of each case which will be highlighted are:

1. the use of 'I', 'you' and 'we'
2. the relationship between the knower and knowee
3. the extent to which the evaluative criteria were negotiated
4. the amount of talking that each person does
5. the congruence between what was said in the post lesson conference and the follow up interview.

CASE STUDY 1 Malcolm and Tony

Malcolm is the student teacher and Tony is the associate teacher.

The post lesson conference that was taped followed a Year 11 Economics class. As Malcolm's associate teacher, Tony, often remarked, this was a difficult class to take in terms of content and the mix of students. The class were 'doing' the law of differentials and so the dilemma or challenge for Malcolm was to develop strategies to help clarify that fairly complex content knowledge. The feedback that Tony provided for Malcolm was a mixture of both positive and negative comments. The way in which Tony structured the post lesson conference was to elaborate on the notes that he had made throughout the lesson. In his commentary on the lesson, Tony covered a range of ideas related to teaching: the need to focus the class with concrete instructions; flexibility in lesson plans to adapt to the behaviour of the class; the success of an analogy in clarifying content; the

positive effects of moving around the class, the pros and cons of stopping a class when work is underway; quiet talk between students as productive in this particular class in helping to create a positive work environment and that sometimes one has to be pragmatic when concluding a lesson.

This case demonstrates key features of Script 1. Note in this script the use of the pronoun 'I'. This script for evaluate is dependent only on what the evaluator thinks and knows with respect to their conception of good practice. The relationship between the evaluator and the evaluatee is dichotomous. One is the knower, the subject and the thinker, the other the knowee, the object and the doer. One way in which this is exemplified in this case is the way in which the post lesson conference reads as a monologue. Tony talks and Malcolm does not get the opportunity to say very much. The transcription came to 2546 words and Malcolm said 189 of those. Tony had 10 talking turns and said an average of 254.6 words per turn. Malcolm had 9 turns and said an average of 21 words per turn. In this post lesson conference no questions were asked. Evaluating in this instance was one way.

The following excerpts (taken from appendix 1) show the way in which Tony is positioned as the knower. Note how everything is predicated on what he thinks.

> "I thought perhaps just the way the lesson was flowing, perhaps the chalk and talk and questions and questions was a little bit over done."
>
> "I thought maybe you improved a lot with your clutch on them, with your general clutch on management, a couple of points you said right I want everyone to listen here, I want everyone to focus on the point I want to make, I thought you became stronger and stronger with that as a list."
>
> "I thought it was good the way you gave that handout out to everyone and then made very clear that all understood your instructions, you stopped and said right I want you all to listen"
>
> "I thought the plant analogy you had was excellent."
>
> "In that sort of case, I would think, perhaps you might have a little bit more, embellish your introduction by saying look, I hate you people to head in the wrong direction, or I hate anyone here to do too much work."

"To me I don't know whether there is a need, I noticed a few of your lessons you've tried to sort of close and I don't know whether it's made a big thing in terms of pedagogical techniques across the road, but I find in the last five minute they're going to retain least of anything."

The I/you relationship in the above examples is very interesting. Tony **thought** something and Malcolm **did** something. The dualism implicit in what Tony is saying establishes a hierarchical relationship.

In some instances Tony's criticisms are based on what he would do. For example he says:

That you put on the board, there's a little bit of chatter, it sort of lost them a little bit and - again and put that on the board, personally I would have probably played it by ear and said right I'm not going to put that on the board, I'm going to get straight into something, that was sort of meant to be a focus for them to sort of say right we're going to do that, I don't know whether they need that, again this is a personal thing, what I tend to do is just do one step at a time say right this is the heading, put this in your books, this is the focus of what we're going to be doing now and then go on.

Here is another example:

but I find in the last five minutes they're going to retain least of anything and as you basically finished today, because they hadn't finished that task I want you to finish that task, I want you to have an honest attempt at it tonight and I'll have a look at it tomorrow, I think that's perhaps a better way to finish rather than just as the bell's going and they've all got their minds on going out to lunch and who I'm going to talk to, say I want to recap now on these points, I think you can do that with adults, say at the end of a lecture of seminar, like a conclusion in a good essay to reinforce the points you've made to the reader, but in that sort of situation I think you're pretty well lost and in some cases you're actually going to undo some of the good you may have built up. You've got to a particular point, they've learnt so much and, if you like, they're almost full, they're almost full up and they can't handle anymore I find at the end and to, particularly if the bell has gone, to say I want to keep here for 30 more seconds just to sort of recap, I think it's perhaps, you know, if you did a little cost benefit analysis, there's more costs than benefits that flow from that.

In these instances, Tony validates his position and his point of view by referring to his own experience. Whilst he is talking about what he **would** do, it is often based on what he **has** done. The shift in tenses in these passages show this. This makes clear that he knows more than Malcolm and in so doing excludes Malcolm's knowledge.

The extracts from the transcript of the evaluation that have been presented also highlight the nature of evaluative criteria that Tony used. As well as being procedural and technical, they were imposed and non-negotiable. There was no consideration of what Malcolm might think. The value that Tony puts on good practice in the way he sets the criteria is subjective and not intersubjective. Tony began by saying that he "might just run through a few things" and in so doing silenced Malcolm.

What was particularly interesting about this case was that both participants aired concerns about the evaluation in the follow up interviews. Malcolm made the following comments:

> it's important for the associate, and this didn't necessarily happen every time and I wish it had've, it's important for the associate to give you time to say how you felt the lesson went, OK so part of the thing about feedback is that you should, they should give you an opportunity for you to speak, they should listen

Malcolm's reasons for saying this are particularly interesting and important:

> .....if I was taking the feedback sessions and I'd do this in other feedback contexts, you should ask the person themself first 'How do you feel it went?', you know, did you think it was all right or did you think it was a bomb or, and then they can come in and they can either confirm or deny some of the things you said, or you know, reinterpret it and say your right, that was very good...

and

> I think most people, everyone has an impression about the lesson, some impression which they can say, now often my impressions initially were wrong and quite often some people are harder on themselves than they should be, some people were softer on themselves than they should be, and quite often I was harder on myself, I thought well that was just atrocious you know, I didn't feel it was right, I had the wrong feeling, and that's when the associate can come in and say either well, yeah there was some things could be improved there or they can say now look, you might have felt that but really you achieved your objectives, you achieved these objectives bang, bang, bang,

OK the time at the end of the lesson wasn't that great but it wasn't a write-off as a lesson, and I stood, the other, the other important thing about giving a student teacher a chance to do that is so that they can start to be realistic about their self assessment because in their on going career as a teacher the self assessment is going to be the

- Most important

For Malcolm, the fact that he did not have the opportunity to air his thoughts, prevented him from really having the chance to negotiate the evaluative criteria, validate his feelings or indeed to reflect in any critical way on his teaching. The process and the content of the feedback were determined by the teacher. Malcolm reinforces this point later in the interview when he says that one of the factors underpinning evaluations is a 'deficit approach', in other words a focus on a need to fill the student teacher up with knowledge about teaching. This deficit notion is interesting because it rests on an assumption that implicit in the nature of evaluating in this context is a dichotomy between thinker/doer; subject/object; expert/novice; master/apprentice; knower/knowing. Tony, albeit unwittingly, takes on a role in the post lesson conference as a knower that requires him to transmit information.

Tony does talk about this during the interview:

I found it difficult to know just how much help to give him in preparing lessons, I mean with this year we're doing work that I have done many, many times before and basically, I mean, I could say to myself well I know what works, I know what task -- at least I think works and what doesn't, do this and don't do that but, I think he would perhaps wouldn't learn as much from that

-It's really hard isn't it?

- It is, it is. Because I sort of want to say, oh you know just do this and it will work.

Whilst I thought Tony did do that during the feedback, he acknowledges the problematic nature of his position as an associate teacher. Tony assumes here that Malcolm will learn more if he does it on his own. This makes a separation in the relationship between the associate teacher and the student teacher. Ironically, in his next statement Tony both grapples with this problem and contradicts his initial statement:

sometimes some things will work for one person but just not for another .....on one occasion he (Malcolm) introduced a new section of work in a particular way and I said well that was good, I'll try it and it was a disaster, it didn't work for me at all.

The relationship and level of interaction between Malcolm and Tony represents a particular way of evaluating, the meaning of which is found in Script 1. Evaluate in this context was hierarchical, non negotiable and based on a strong knower/knowee dichotomy. The comment made by both Malcolm and Tony in the follow up interviews indicate that there was not a shared understanding of the meaning and purpose of evaluating in this context. There is a lack of recognition that both participants know something about teaching. The interaction between the participants is not intersubjective in the sense that the discussion does not emanate from the interests and concerns of both people, nor is it critical in the sense that the interaction does not take place with respect to what others think. In this instance the associate teacher, through the evaluation, had control of what was said in the post lesson conference in a way that limited the potential for a more diverse understanding of classroom practice and teaching knowledge.

CASE STUDY 2:

Helen is the student teacher and Richard is the associate teacher.

The feedback session that was taped followed a lesson with a Year 11 class who were doing a unit of work on the Arab/Israeli conflict. Two things that immediately struck me about this post lesson conference was that it is a dialogue and it was long! This feedback session lasted over an hour. These two things are significant because they reflect the values of both the student teacher and the associate teacher and the sort of relationship they have. More specifically this is significant because it says something about the way the participants interact in order to evaluate this lesson and therefore throws light on the meaning of evaluate in this context.

The meaning of evaluate in Script 2 provides a model for the analysis of this case. Note the key ways in which Script 1 differs from Script 2. The use of the pronoun 'we' is crucial because it suggests partnership. This is borne out through the evaluating process which is subjective and intersubjective. Both participants know something about teaching and have a point of view about good practice. They say things to each other about the lesson with respect to these factors in a way that is seeking consensus for teaching activities in the future.

Examples from the transcript of the post lesson conference demonstrate these points. In the exchange Richard had 91 turns and Helen had 90. The average length of these turns for Richard was 34.2 words and for Helen 23.7 words. This is much closer than the average word per turn for Malcolm and Tony. Within this Helen and Richard asked each other questions and there were numerous interjections. This suggests that evaluating in this context was conversational and interactive. Both participants evaluate together. The following passage is typical of the nature of the interchange. A is the associate teacher, Richard and B is the student teacher, Helen.

> A: Yeah I think, well I was doing my participation chart and after a while I didn't need to do it because you were getting access to every person, by walking around and talking to them
>
> B: But, when you do that participation chart up did you mean that I was having access to everyone when they were already in their groups and starting to work on the documents or before hand?
>
> A: No, after they started the group work
>
> B: During, yeah during the group work. Because what about the introduction?
>
> A: Because you were then free, free to approach them
>
> B: Yes, well exactly and I spoke to everyone in the class then, but the introduction bit, what, what did we do, we talked about Hertzel's primary document and the news, what about their participation rate there, did I, did I get to them all?
>
> A: No
>
> B: No, so that's what that chart is?

A: No what was happening was the usual thing, the dominant people were talking you...but it wasn't bad, it was better, in fact I think I, I noticed you getting to the quiet girls and

B: Yeah, I asked them specifically, yeah

A: But having noticed that I then noticed that once they started working in groups it was even better and the same was true today, you got access multiple times to every student

B: Well it's a lot easier to do that, I mean your not talking to the class as a whole

The focus in this section was on the participation rates for the students. It is worth noting that this was something that Helen and Richard had talked about before the lesson and so the purpose of the group work strategy that was used was to encourage student participation. The criteria for the evaluation in this sense had been negotiated during the preparation of the lesson. In this section Helen asked three questions. This was not simply to clarify but also served as a means by which she could negotiate the evaluative criteria. She did this by asking about the participation rate in the introductory part of the lesson. Helen's statement at the end of this excerpt shows that she has placed her own value on this activity. Both participants are telling each other what they think about the activity and both are putting a positive value on it.

Likewise the following excerpt shows that both Richard and Helen have the opportunity to think about their practice with respect to what the other person thinks and with respect to what they think is good practice.

A: I sort of do that group work stuff as a matter of course, but I don't think about it like I did these two times so it was very valuable for me to see what could be gained from the group work, because sometimes you'll put them to a group and you'll have something else to do and you'll take the opportunity to do that thing and let them play on by themselves, and just sort of visit them irregularly, and because you were following up both sides were getting lots out of it I think, both you and them

B: Yeah, I think it worked well, it certainly worked for me because that was the first opportunity I had to, to sort of chat with them on the individual basis, but it also gave me a chance to learn

what they actually knew as well which was virtually nothing most of them, and in actual fact it clarified a lot of things in my mind as well because, in explaining about all the different documents and how they fitted in to them I mean, it helped me get an overall picture for the thing, that was just sort of a side benefit from the whole exercise

A: Yes it was forcing me to do the same thing, because even though I prepare that stuff and I learn it then, two years later, 4 years later you need to refresh your memory

B: Well it's different too

A: It's one again, so I was finding myself asking questions, well, do I remember what the significance of this and that was and I started engaging in some of the groups myself to try and solve a couple of problems. That's the kind of atmosphere I think you can get in a class that, is on your side, if you've got a hostile class you can't do much

It is this sort of interchange that has a dramatic effect on the knower/knowee relationship inherent in the meaning of evaluate. Richard's statements show that he was participating in the lesson. He was not merely an observer. They were both agreeing on what they thought the value of the lesson was. Helen also has the chance to say what she thinks and knows in this situation. Helen is also a knower in this situation:

B: Yeah, and speaking about learning happening when it's in context, that was the beauty of that whole exercise that, with the drawn it together at the end they were all following it thinking oh yes OK that's how my document fit's in...I thought thy were quite attentive to that whole thing, they listened really well, they weren't sort of switching off

Richard acknowledges and validates Helen's ideas. The following excerpt is taken from a discussion of the work of particular individuals in the class. He begins by asking Helen for her perspective on the work that some of the students were doing.

A: I wanted to talk, this might prove something to both of us, I wanted to talk about how you rate the students afterwards because, I spent most of my time just looking and seeing how they were contributing, so I found some interesting

Helen presents her point of view by saying:

B: They were more analytical about it too, rather than just looking at the documents, OK this is what it is, with some of the pairs I had to go up to them and say now that you've discovered what it is, because all they'd done was read it and thought OK this is it, we've done our work, and so I had to go up to them and say well, how does this fit into the whole perspective, the historical perspective and how does this clarify in you mind who started it and this question and that question but, yeah, those three had sort of figured that all out for themselves anyway

Richard's response recognises Helen's knowledge:

A: You actually know more than me in a sense, now I could see them from a distance and say who was performing, but then I didn't check to see.

Toward the end of the post lesson conference the focus shifts to the future. The comments made are with reference to future practice. The discussion of what happened in this lesson becomes the starting point for what might happen in the next lesson.

A: I had a talk to them about it, they needed extra information too, that was their problem

B: Yes they did

A: They really didn't and it took me a while to realise that the secondary source didn't go far enough for them, so I gave them that PLO stuff

B: Yeah, though they drew some stuff out of it

A: You might be able to use them next time because they've read some of the propaganda, next time we might introduce the propaganda, I'm just sorting through my files and I found a few more bits of Jewish propaganda, quite simple to deal with, and your arguments about Yasa Arafait

B: Yeah I want, the thing they also need to talk about is terrorism, the terrorism side of it

A: And the video on terrorism, so all of those things could come together next double, and use, use Hamish and his group to start it off and link the two

B: Yeah, yeah OK, that'll work

Here a sense of partnership is obvious. Richard, interestingly, uses both you and we in *one statement. The emphasis is on working* together and reaching agreement about the way in which what they say determines the direction for what they do in the future. In this context evaluate is part of a larger cycle.

The follow up interviews with Richard and Helen confirm these aspects of their relationship. Richard provides support for Helen in the same way that he does for students in his class. Helen is encouraged to experiment and work by trial and error yet she is not left to simply learn on her own. Richard says:

> so while you might confuse, you might challenge, you might provoke a person to taking risks, you're there to make sure they stay afloat and in this college it is possible to spend a lot of time with individuals to give them a chance to redraft and reformulate their ideas and then reinforce it as it gets better, to help them fix it up as it goes right, it's not enough to provoke and to upset and to get people to make these leaps of imagination without coming along with the sort of vertical ruler and saying well we've got to put things back into shape a little bit, without the other side it's probably crazy to do the provocative bit and I think that applies as much to teacher training, that people have got to have reeds to cling to before you throw them into deeper ponds and say find your way out. I think that's what I'm doing, I'm never really sure. (interview)

Richard elaborates on this point by describing what he sees as a feature of the culture of teaching in his particular workplace:

> ....when we work together as full professionals if you like to call it that we see each other as equals and, equals who complement each others skills, that's especially the case in here, we've got people in here who come from vastly different backgrounds but we do a lot of sharing and we use one and others skills, we know that each person has particular skills and we value that and I think that's the culture of teaching in that we are very good communicators, very good team workers and we do sort of treat each other as having something to offer, and even not as equals in the sort of statistical sense, that we have to work together, working alone is not going to get us far at all, so I'd encourage that culture in students so that when you're in the place your a full member or an active member, even if you're the junior member in a sense.

What is significant to Richard about the culture of teaching is a sense of sharing and communicating with other teachers. This is a culture that Helen is a welcome part of. She is treated as an individual with particular skills and she is invited to and expected to work with the other teachers and with Richard in particular, as a team. Richard states quite clearly that the interaction between student teacher and associate should be collaborative:

> I really do feel that teachers teaching teachers should be, should see the relationship as much as possible as a relationship of two colleagues rather than someone who's the apprentice and someone who's the master.

For Richard there is a two way flow of ideas:

> I mean certainly I've got more experience and more knowledge and more tricks up my sleeve than she has but I saw us as sharing that class, I think we both got a lot out of, got a lot of stimulation from that, the class that day it must have been a double period or something

and

> .....in fact I was getting a lot out of that session because I was in the position of observer which is rare for me and I was making, I thought, better quality decisions about the responses of those students.

Richard's position is clear. The work that he does with Helen is negotiated and reciprocal. He recognises that his experience is a resource that Helen at this stage does not possess, but one that he shares to enable her to develop her own knowledge of classroom practices. It is through these shared experiences that Helen begins to articulate her own theories of teaching and her own position in a teaching culture.

Helen provided some interesting background to the lesson that was the focus for this particular evaluation and it typifies the way in which Richard and Helen worked as a team and also how Richard encouraged Helen to take risks:

> .....the background to this lesson was that I had the lesson planned as just like straight group work and then they were going to write something or something like that and he said ten minutes before the lesson, why don't we try it this way? And I said to him 'hmm let me think about that, I'm

not sure whether that will work and he said 'oh, well let's try it and see', because he'd never tried doing that before either so I said OK, so I sat down for ten minutes and madly tried to figure out what we were going to do and we went in their so the whole thing was a bit of an experiment.

The use of 'we' in this passage again shows the degree of partnership. Helen was also in a position to negotiate the evaluative criteria. She did this by asking questions.

In Richard's case I think he was exhaustive in giving me feedback, but in another respect I also asked him a lot of questions about what I, what I wanted to know .

Helen's comments below confirm the collaborative nature of the evaluating and the recognition of her knowledge as a part of this:

C: Did you find it - interactive the way

B: Oh absolutely

C: Yeah?

B: And also far less threatening than if he had come and said right, these are the good points about your lesson and these are the bad points, lets discuss them and in saying that there was a structure to these feedback sessions in terms that I did receive that written sheet with, it would always have positive points and negative points, we didn't actually discuss them point by point, more of a general conversation that worked

C: Because it seemed almost as if you were working as a team

B: Exactly and less that I was the apprentice and he was the God

A: None of that

B: And I was there to be instructed, yeah, I think it, I'm not saying he had a lot of respect for me but we had mutual respect for each other and he said in many points of time, yeah I'm going to learn things off you as well here which is fantastic and it all helped to give me confidence, the way that things were.

The points that Helen makes here are crucial to an understanding of the relationship between Helen and Richard and the way in which they evaluated the lesson. The master/apprentice, teacher/student and knower/knowee dichotomies were challenged. These dualisms rest on a power relationship and in many ways are an implicit part of the culture of the practicum and evaluating in the practicum. In the Richard and Helen relationship, they were both thinking and doing; both theorising and practicing. Evaluating has an interactive and responsive quality in this context. In this case there was congruence between the participants in their understanding of the purpose and meaning of evaluate.

In this post lesson conference the evaluative criteria were negotiated and contextualised. What was talked about emerged from Richard's interests and Helen's concerns that were relevant to the particularities of the lesson and the students in the class. Helen was considered a junior member of staff rather than an apprentice in a way that recognised what she knew. The interaction between Richard and Helen was collaborative and cooperative.

CONCLUSION:

In these two case studies the associate teacher and student teacher participate in different ways in order to evaluate what the student teacher does in the classroom. What was said in the post lesson conferences can be read and interpreted in different ways. To develop a picture and an understanding of what was happening I drew on what was actually said in the post lesson conferences, the comments and analysis of the participants in the follow up interviews, different understandings of the meaning of evaluate and my own experiences. Drawing on this I was able to develop a point of view on what constitutes good evaluating.

The relationship and nature of interaction between the participants in these two case studies show different conceptions of what it means to evaluate. The dualisms implicit in the meaning of evaluate serve to structure particular ways of thinking and the dynamics of the relationship between the evaluator and the evaluatee. From this point what and how something is said or not said in the evaluation represents the particular perspectives of the participants. In case 1 the criteria are not negotiated, the roles of the participants are hierarchical and the dominant values expressed are those of the teacher. His values are set within a conception of teaching as transmission of knowledge. In case 2 the criteria for evaluation are negotiated, the roles are collaborative and what the participants value in their

teaching is based on joint understanding between student and teacher. The degree of distance between the participants is related to the meaning of evaluate in the particular context and the extent to which the participants have a shared understanding of that meaning. When the meaning of evaluate is based on a shared understanding and when the interaction between the participants is relational, then there is the potential to reflect on practice and enhance learning

References:

Cherryholmes, Cleo (1993) "Reading Research", **Journal of Curriculum Studies** Vol 25 No 1

Davies, Bronwyn (1994) **Poststructuralist theory and classroom practice** Deakin University

Dewey, John (1944) **Democracy and Education** The Free Press

Fish, Della (1989) **Learning Through Practice in Initial Teacher Training** Kogan Page

Liston, Daniel and Zeichner, Kenneth (1991) **Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Schooling** Routledge

Shopen, T and Shopen, G (1994) personal communication

Shon, Donald (1987) **Educating the Reflective Practitioner** Jossey Bass Publishers

Smyth, John (1991) **Teachers as Collaborative Learners** Oxford University Press

A: I thought it was a good lesson overall, particularly given a few things, it's probably the most difficult lesson, I mean it's probably the most difficult area of economics to teach, and it's clearly these guys - lack of continuity I think, they've done, I mean they couldn't, if you to mention the fact that, I think you people have done something law of area proportions and not one of them, like we spent three lessons on it

B: -

A: A number of times, a number of times we did this massive diagram on the farmers land and he gets out and he fences for a day by himself and he gets 100m done so he gets a friend next day he gets 220 done and then things get worse in the end and I'm talking to them, told them the Irish joke, you've to mention the Irish joke about the jumbo jet crashing, I mean, that's amazing, we had a week in the library last week doing research and it's come basically the wrong time, I wanted it earlier but the libraries, it's booked three weeks ahead so I had to get it then which is unfortunate timing and that's obviously come into play, I might just run through a few things, as I said firstly it's a different area to teach and, which ever way it's addressed I think it's, some students are going to be a bit lost regardless. That you put on the board, there's a little bit of chatter, it sort of lost them a little bit and - again and put that on the board, personally I would have probably played it by ear and said right I'm not going to put that on the board, I'm going to get straight into something, that was sort of meant to be a focus for them to sort of say right we're going to do that, I don't know whether they need that, again this is a personal thing, what I tend to do is just do one step at a time say right this is the heading, put this in your books, this is the focus of what we're going to be doing now and then go on. In other words, give them concrete instructions of saying, right, this is what we're going to do first, put that heading down and then have discussion, give them a definition they can write it down, as you were doing basically, just a point

B: Maybe I should have done it before the lesson started, that's why

A: Have it on the board already, yeah, because that was another problem, came straight from the other class, I had race off to something very important, to go to the toilet, and I said I was going to bring an overhead projector down and I forgot that and so you know, a little bit of a schmozzle which is a lot to do with me. I thought it was good, no, no, perhaps it was because you were nervous, a couple of people in here were looking at you, you asked a number of questions early and people were just falling out, they weren't putting their hands up, probably because of nerves because it was fine the other day, particularly in year 9 making a point, no don't call out, put your hand up, one at a time - nerves basically that point, because I know your normally pretty firm with that, I thought perhaps just the way the lesson was flowing, perhaps the chalk and talk and questions and questions was a little bit over done

B: Right

A: Good, and some of these, I mean, it's a difficult area, some of the concepts which you were trying to get to particularly diagrammatically they don't sort of lend themselves to, I've put down here guess what could be in this box type questions, you know, can anyone tell me what the shape of this curve might look like, very difficult, really difficult I think you know, when they've not really done that before, you know what I mean, and that can be a little bit annoying to students where it's such an open ended question, questions which they feel in themselves, oh I should be able to answer that or, I should be able to work it our particularly that last one, I noted down look at the marginal cost of this, really, problem

was, you probably saw that yourself that you had that down as your list plan, that's where I think your lesson - with your list plans they're a guide, you need to be flexible, sometimes you need to say right that's not going to work, I need cut that bit off, I need to sort of, I need to get them down to work now, their becoming distracted, their becoming jittery and not listening, so I need to change the stimulus and get them down to work, perhaps you could have even left totally marginal cost today, left it as discovery in the exercise, they could have discovered it in doing that exercise which you gave out. I thought maybe you improved a lot with your clutch on them, with your general clutch on management, a couple of points you said right I want everyone to listen here, I want everyone to focus on the point I want to make, I thought you became stronger and stronger with that as a list - , I thought the plant analogy you had was excellent and what I thought in particular was the way in which you handled some of the crazy answers the kids gave, even the fact that some of the shapes of the plant had similar shapes to the -of cost rules, they actually looked more like the average total physical product curve, but I mean I thought that was really good, and that gave a good expose of the law of area of proportion I thought that worked really well, I thought they were really starting to understand what it was about with that, I mean I was amazed at the, none of them could actually relate even the, I mean we took, two weeks ago we did so much but too many cooks spoiling the broth situation, I found that amazing, not one of them, but as - said to me this is a strange class because the most capable students give the least in this class, some of the least capable students always have answers which is a bit of a problem and some of the bright students get annoyed at that but their not prepared to volunteer answers themselves, it's really odd, it's a strange mix. Yes, I put down again marginal cost was perhaps pushing it a little bit when you got to that, I thought it was good the way you gave that handout out to everyone and then made very clear that all understood your instructions, you stopped and said right I want you all to listen, I want you all to before you even start, I mean these guys had actually already started you said no no I'm sorry, put your pens down, I want you to make sure your all doing the right thing, I thought that was good, and after you'd actually set them down to the task you remained sort of mobile, you didn't sort of stand and have a rest at the corner, you walked around and had a look at the students work, were looking for problems, were looking for students who, perhaps didn't know where to start or were just heading in the wrong direction, it's a pity that you had to do, I find that myself, you had to stop them at one stage and say right put your pens down, sometimes what I do for that sort of thing where you really feel you've got to interrupt them, you've got to, you want to stop them, it a bit of an annoyance to those guys because they're just getting into the work and all of a sudden, you want to change the focus again, back to you , but sometimes, but I mean you've got to weight that up sometimes and say that it's so important that I have to, and clearly you have that in your mind, it's so important I've got to stop this work, even though at last there getting busily down to work and their, but there's something important that you want to say, and I think, you probably made the right decisions. In that sort of case, I would think, perhaps you might have a little bit more, embellish your introduction by saying look, I hate you people to head in the wrong direction, or I hate anyone here to do to much work or, you know, almost in a way as to say well look if you don't listen, if you don't listen and interrupt your work and listen to me your going to waste all your time, and perhaps that's a sort of way of breaking into that sort of situation which is an awful way, I mean I think you saw that, I mean there is no doubt, and you're in two minds as to wether to say something but you feel it's so important that it's necessary to say